Subject: Japan’s proposal on the structure of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework

In response to the invitation of SCBD/OES/CPP/JMF/88326, Japan would like to submit views on the structure of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework as follows:

(1)Overall Views

* The post-2020 global biodiversity framework should be consistent with the scope of the Convention.
* The post-2020 global biodiversity framework should be built up based on the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. Therefore, we should not develop a new framework with lower target levels than those of the current targets. Simultaneously, we should avoid an overcomplicated framework, such as an inclusion of too many targets. Japan also believes that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework needs to have appropriate implementation mechanisms for ensuring the achievement.

 (2) Rationale and scope

* Given that there are eight paragraphs in the current strategic plan as rationale (https://www.cbd.int/doc/decisions/cop-10/cop-10-dec-02-en.pdf), the section of the next framework should be shorter than before and easy to read but also influential with scientific evidence.
* According to Non-paper 1 version 2 of OEWG 1, shown on https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/6f62/5c58/b51c8ebb49511787cc3e972d/wg2020-01-nonpaper-02-en.pdf, “theory of change” and “principles” were discussed as possible elements to be reflected. Yet, it is necessary to clarify what they mean for the inclusion of these elements.

 (3) Vision2050

* The post-2020 global biodiversity framework should maintain the 2050 Vision that shows the long-term direction. Japan believes that it is beneficial to develop common and concrete understanding of the status in which 2050 Vision “Living in harmony with nature” is realized.
* By identifying the status in which the 2050 Vision is realized, the status to be achieved and the actions to be taken by 2030 will be clarified.
* In the process of developing the common understanding of the status to be achieved, the concepts including “No Net Loss”, “Planetary Boundaries” and “Ecological footprint” should be taken into account.

 (4)Mission and Apex Goal

* Since it has been already decided at COP14 that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should be accompanied by an inspirational and motivating 2030 mission as a stepping stone towards the 2050 Vision in the decision CBD/COP/DEC/14/34, we need to promote the discussion on it. It is needed to identify the status of biodiversity to be achieved in 2030 through the developing process of the common understanding of the status of the 2050 Vision.
* The mission should be communicable, attractive and concise. At the same time, it should be able to foster a common understanding of its status among countries and should be measurable and achievable. Furthermore, it is necessary to clarify the differences in the roles between the mission and the goals to be developed under the mission and to organize them without duplication (According to Non-paper 1 version 2 of OEWG 1, shown on https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/6f62/5c58/b51c8ebb49511787cc3e972d/wg2020-01-nonpaper-02-en.pdf, the differences between the missions and goals were not clear).
* If we can set the mission as milestones at 2030 toward the achievement of the 2050 Vision and describe the status of the mission by a single or a few indicator(s), we could set it as an Apex Goal. However, we need careful scientific consideration when setting a single Apex Goal, since the mission would contain multiple elements such as those related to the conservation and the sustainable use of biodiversity.

 (5)Goals and Targets

* It is appropriate to develop 1)the goals showing the specific status to be achieved under the mission and 2) the targets showing the specific actions to be implemented to achieve the goals. They should be developed in light of the feasibility and measurability within the time limits. In addition, as it is important to ensure the coherence between the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and the SDGs, we should identify the way how we achieve it.
* The goals should also be expressed by understandable words that draws public attention, and targets should be communicable words that will lead people to an action.
* While we believe that the Aichi Biodiversity Targets should be a basis for developing goals and targets, it is also important to consider the direct and indirect drivers related to biodiversity loss and the interventions for transformative change noted in the IPBES Global Assessment when setting goals and targets.

 (6) Means of implementation and enable conditions

* According to Non-paper 1 version 2 of OEWG 1, shown on https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/6f62/5c58/b51c8ebb49511787cc3e972d/wg2020-01-nonpaper-02-en.pdf, “ecosystem based management” is mentioned as a possible element to reflect. Likewise, it is effective to develop plans and make efforts based on the concept of “landscape approaches” when addressing the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity outside of strictly protected areas as well as to strengthen the implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. Accordingly, it is important to place this concept in “means of implementation and enable conditions” or other appropriate component of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework in order to integrate the concept into each NBSAP.

 (7)Implementation Mechanism

* The NBSAPs and the National Reports should be the main mechanisms for the implementation and reporting process under the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. At the same time, we need to consider clarifying to which degree each national effort contributes to the achievement of the global target in such national documents.